

REMARKS

Claims 74-84, 86, 88-94, and 97-109 are pending in this application. Claims 77, 83, 84, 86, 92-94, 97, 98, 101, 102, and 104 have been changed by this amendment, claims 85, 87, 95, and 96 have been cancelled, and claims 106-109 have been added. Applicant reserves the right to introduce claims of original scope in a continuation or other related application.

The Examiner rejected claims 75-78, 81, 82, 84-94, and 104 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner stated that "said rigid portion" in line 2 of claim 75 lacks antecedent basis; however, claim 74 recites a rigid portion in line 11 to provide antecedent basis. The remaining rejected claims have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's rejections, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 83, 94, 96-103, and 105 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gillio, U.S. Patent No. 5,704,791. Applicant respectfully traverses. Claim 83 recites a friction drive mechanism that includes a drive roller and a drive bar in frictional contact with said drive roller, where the drive bar is curved such that the drive bar forms a portion of an arc having a radius of greater length than a radius of the drive roller. In contrast, Gillio discloses in Fig. 5 a flexible hose 108 formed in a loop, where the hose is grasped by the user and moved through a box that includes rollers 230-236 that contact the hose directly. Gillio does not disclose or suggest providing a user manipulatable object, physically contacted by a user, in addition to a friction drive mechanism having a drive bar forming a portion of an arc, where the friction drive mechanism is coupled between an actuator and the user manipulatable object as recited in claim 83. Applicant therefore believes that claim 83 is patentable and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 94 recites a friction drive mechanism includes a moving member, a drive bar, and a drive roller. To expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended claim 94 to recite that the moving member is moveable in a rotary degree of freedom similar to dependent claim 95, which is not disclosed or suggested by Gillio. Applicant therefore believes that claim 94 is patentable. Claims 97-100 are dependent on claim 94 and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 94.

Claim 101 recites a method for producing a force including frictionally engaging a drive roller with a drive bar and transmitting a rotational force to the drive bar and a user manipulatable object. To expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended claim 101 to recite that

the drive bar is rotatable in a rotary degree of freedom and the rotational force provides a force to the drive bar in the rotary degree of freedom of the drive bar, and therefore is believed patentable over Gillio for reasons similar to those explained for claim 94. Claims 102, 103, and 105 are dependent on claim 101 and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 101.

Claims 106-109 have been added as dependent claims and recite features described in the specification on pages 47 and 48 of the specification and Figures 23a-23f.

The Examiner rejected claims 74-105 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 37 of U.S. Patent No. 5,731,804. Applicant respectfully traverses. The Examiner has not shown where in claim 37 of Patent No. 5,731,804 that a frictional contact or engagement between a drive roller and a driven member or bar is disclosed as is claimed in the present application. Claim 37 recites a gimbal mechanism and a transducers, but no drive rollers or members in frictional contact or engagement. The features of Figures 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8 that the Examiner cites are not recited in claim 37, and these figures only disclose a capstan drum with a flexible cable-type connection between capstan roller and drum. Applicant therefore believes that claims 74-105 are not obvious in view of claim 37, and respectfully requests that the obviousness-type double patenting rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Riegel
Reg. 36,651

San Jose, California
(408) 467-1900